

JOB PRINTING  
The Review Job Department is equipped to do first class commercial printing.

# COCHISE REVIEW

THE DISPATCHES  
Received by the Review  
For Pub Libr... of the cream of the  
world's news. Read them.

VOLUME IV.

BISBEE, ARIZONA, WEDNESDAY EVENING, OCTOBER 31, 1900.

NUMBER 249

## THE REPUBLICAN ADVOCATE

CONDUCTED BY THE COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE



### REPUBLICAN TICKET

#### NATIONAL

For President  
**WILLIAM MCKINLEY**  
of Ohio  
For Vice-President  
**THEODORE ROOSEVELT**  
of New York

#### TERRITORIAL

For Delegate to Congress  
**HON. N. O. MURPHY**

#### REPUBLICAN COUNTY TICKET

For Councilman  
**C. C. WARNER**  
For Assemblyman  
**H. M. WOODS**  
**F. R. O'BRIEN**  
**A. H. NORCROSS**  
For Sheriff  
**DAYTON GRAHAM**  
For Treasurer  
**C. L. CUMMINGS**  
For Recorder  
**H. C. STILLMAN**  
For District Attorney  
**G. W. SWAIN**  
For Probate Judge  
**W. F. BRADLEY**  
For Assessor  
**C. A. OVERLOCK**  
For Surveyor  
**J. A. ROCKFELLOW**  
For Supervisors  
**G. B. REAY**  
**A. V. NOYES**  
**T. ALLAIRE**  
For Superintendent of Schools  
**F. C. WILLARD**

#### PRECINCT.

For Justice of the Peace  
**S. K. WILLIAMS**  
**W. W. WEED**  
For Constable  
**MICHAEL DOYLE**  
**F. W. OLIVER**

#### REPUBLICAN COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE

**JOHN A. CAMPBELL**, Chairman.  
**H. C. LANDAN**, Secretary.  
Bisbee—John A. Campbell, J. J. Multhead, J. S. Taylor, Ed. Wittle, Ed. Scott, E. G. Newton, P. Johnston, Scott Whaley, L. J. Overlock, James Farley, A. W. Kindred, H. C. Landan.  
Tombstone—A. H. Emanuel, F. N. Wolcott, J. H. Montgomery, W. A. Harwood, C. J. West.  
Wilcox—W. F. Nichols, John F. Crowley, P. B. Soto, H. A. Morgan.  
Pecos—C. M. Renaud, Arthur Wright, John Brockman.  
Benson—Wm. Shilliam, H. Gerwein.  
Fairbank—Ben Heney, James L. Herrick, Haco—E. V. Daniels.  
Tree Alamos—Marcus Pachico.  
St. David—A. H. Norcross.  
West Huachuca—W. C. Shinn.  
Cochise—E. P. Newton.  
Great Western Camp—D. Brown.  
Pool's Ranch—Sam Boho.  
Turquoise—F. R. O'Brien.  
San Simon—C. E. St. John.  
Dee Cabezas—T. C. Bala, Perry Wildman.  
Johnson—Harry Catalan.  
Russellville—Asa Walker.

### THAT BLACKLISTING BILL

The Democrats have discovered that Governor Murphy vetoed a bill passed by the legislature against blacklisting by corporations. Awful, wasn't it? But let's see how it was. The Republican has looked up the record and finds:  
"It is true Mr. Parr did introduce such a bill, and after a hard struggle with a Democratic legislature he succeeded in getting it passed. It was properly signed by the speaker of the house and the president of the council, certified to by the territorial secretary and sent into the executive chamber. The governor took a look at it and discovered that it carried no enacting clause. No farther time was spent on the measure. He simply vetoed it. Had he signed it the only effect would have been to give the printer an extra dollar or two for placing it in the session laws, and the statutes would simply have been encumbered with a measure under which no one could be convicted, and the only result would have been to make the governor participate originally to an act of Democratic stupidity."

### MARK'S LAND GRANT RECORD

It was in conformity with the eternal fitness of things that Rochester Ford and Marcus A. Smith should appear and speak jointly at the same meeting, for it is well known that for six years Mark Smith was understood to be the representative of Arizona's land grants in Washington, while Rochester Ford was fighting for the grants in Arizona. It was more than once charged against Smith, and never denied, that he was under pay from land grant owners. It is a fact of record that Smith fought the creation of the Land Court; that when the congressional committee reported unanimously in its favor, Smith, their delegate in congress, insisted upon and had Arizona stricken from the bill. At the next session of congress when an amendment was offered to again include Arizona, Smith opposed it; but Arizona was included notwithstanding his objections, and the Land Court then and there created regardless of Mark Smith's objection and Rochester Ford's opposition as the land grant lawyer, has settled every land grant title in Arizona. It was an amusing spectacle to see these two land grant statesmen (?) on the stage shouting for honesty, when if could they have had their way the land court would not have been created, and the land grant barons would still be occupying the lands now enjoyed by thousands of people.  
The Peralta fraud which the court smashed would still be a cloud on the lands of Maricopa, Gila, Graham, Pima, Santa Cruz and Cochise counties, and these county lands would still have been covered with fraudulent land grant titles. Phoenix, Nogales, and other settlements would still be under the cloud of uncertain titles and the lands of Salt River, Gila, Santa Cruz and the San Pedro valleys would suffer the same way. Smith and Ford are nice men to call into question the honesty of others.—Tucson Citizen.

### MARK AND A DAMSITE

It's really funny to note that Editor Reppy of the Florence Tribune gives credit to Mark Smith for that \$20,000 appropriation made for the survey of the San Carlos damsite. We happen to know that the appropriation was made through the recommendation of F. K. Newell, chief of the hydrographic bureau of the geological survey. Professor Newell is the foremost exponent of correct irrigation methods in the nation today. He is thoroughly familiar with the topographical features, watersheds and rainfalls of the southwest; under his direction and instructions it was that Arthur Davis and other engineers of the hydrographic bureau came to Arizona and spent several years in studying local conditions, to gain data on which the government might work toward the construction of waters storage reservoirs. The Davis party, after months of work, condemned the Buttes damsite above Florence on the Gila and located the San Carlos damsite as infinitely preferable. The San Carlos damsite appropriation was only one of a number in a list submitted by the hydrographic office. If Mark Smith was so effective as an appropriation getter, how did it happen that the people of Florence maintained Rev. Dr. Whittemore, their townsman, as a special lobbyist at Washington at that time? Their action betokened no great confidence in Marcus Aurelius, did it?

His (the governor's) speech contained no discourteous allusion to his political opponent.—Globe Silver Belt.  
Can the Belt say as much of any speech delivered by Mark Smith in this campaign? On the contrary, Mr. Smith has done nothing but vilify the governor.—Republican.

Arizona Territorial 5 per cent bonds are selling in New York at 109 1/2. The funding act did it. The writer well remembers when Arizona 10 per cent warrants sold in Phoenix at only 90 cents. And yet the democratic orators would that all this were changed.  
In the last year of Republican administration, national and territorial, the bank deposits of Arizona have increased from \$2,060,986 to \$4,733,305. Looks as though the Arizonans were prospering.  
The Democrats are admitting that Murphy will come down to Phoenix from the north with at least 1,000 plurality. Then, how in the world does Mark expect to be elected?

### WHAT SMITH DID FOR ARIZONA

Irritated by the iteration of the question, "What has Mark Smith done in his ten years in congress?" the Democratic press has raked up the fragment of a deed, in that Mark once passed a statehood bill through one house, only to have it die in the other. Great record, isn't it? Mark did it, even if he was aided at the time by a strong lobby from Phoenix, Tucson and Prescott. One of the Arizona workers for statehood then in Washington was one N. O. Murphy, there at his own expense, with no brass band attachment, there only to secure statehood for the territory. When Mark was delegate, Arizona always had to send special delegations to Washington when anything was wanted. It was said at the time that Mark had too hard a time maintaining his poker record against the Washington experts to have much time to devote to the house of representatives or to the interests of his constituents. But, leaving out reference to the prominent Arizonans who aided, they say that Mark really was in congress when a statehood bill slipped through the house. Bueno! Magnifico!

The best way of figuring out a record is by comparison. While Mark was in congress, what were other territorial delegates doing? Were they accumulating bob-tailed flushes and red-pine experience in the back rooms of Ebbitt house cafe? Not on your life!

The record is too long to search through, but while Mark Smith was in congress the delegates from Wyoming, Dakota, Montana and Idaho passed bills to add five states to the Union—passed them through BOTH houses, and had them signed by the President. Ten senators and five representatives were added to the enrollment of congress during Smith's occupancy of office, and yet there are Democrats who pretend to be satisfied with his record. Montana and New Mexico delegates got big appropriations from the Government for territorial capitols, but Smith's constituents have been compelled to go down into their jeans to the tune of \$130,000 for the same purpose. There is a costly United States building in Santa Fe, New Mexico, secured by the good work of a New Mexican delegate in congress. Does any such building grace Phoenix? Down in Nogales, are the Federal offices decently housed?

Verily, it is true that Mark Smith did nothing in congress for Arizona. He failed even in his efforts to kill the Land Court bill and other measures introduced by others that were of incidental benefit to the territory.

### THE TURQUOISE MEETING

Some letters received from Gleeson, the Turquoise district, tell of success for the territorial and county republican tickets in that neck of the woods. The county candidates were given an enthusiastic reception upon arrival. In the evening there was a rousing meeting, held in the spacious dining room of McCowan's hotel, which patriotic ladies had tastefully decorated for the occasion. Practically the whole population of the little camp, comprising about 100 adults, constituted the audience. Though the camp is a small one, it is an enterprising one and boasts an excellent orchestra, which added materially to the enjoyment of the evening. The meeting was a pleasing one. The nominees all talked well, encouraged by the genial attitude of their audience. Applause was freely given and it was plainly shown that Turquoise was with the speakers and the cause they represented. Everything was harmonious and the visitors left much encouraged. During their stay they were the especial guests of F. R. O'Brien, one of the legislative nominees, who did everything possible to make their visit a pleasant one.

### PRETTY GOOD PAY.

Delegate to Congress, per annum \$6,000  
Counsel for Wham robbers ?  
Total ? ?  
Who got the swag?  
Dr. H. A. Hughes, of Phoenix, holds rank as one of the leading democrats of Arizona. He publicly says that N. O. Murphy was the best delegate Arizona ever sent to congress.  
Governor Murphy will be in Bisbee again November 3, accompanied by Judge Charles Wright, the wittiest orator of the southwest, and J. C. Adams, chairman of the Territorial Republican Committee and a clear and convincing talker on the stump.

## The Democratic Messenger

EDITED BY THE COCHISE COUNTY DEMOCRATIC CENTRAL COMMITTEE



### DEMOCRATIC TICKET

#### NATIONAL

For President  
**WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN**  
of Nebraska  
For Vice-President  
**ADLAI E. STEVENSON**  
of Illinois

#### TERRITORIAL

For Delegate to Congress  
**MARCUS A. SMITH**  
of Pima

#### COUNTY

For Councilman  
**JAMES S. ROBINSON**, of Tombstone  
For Assemblyman  
**STEPHEN ROMER**, of Benson  
**J. EDWARD BROWN**, of Bisbee  
**MICHAEL GRAY**, of Pecos  
For Sheriff  
**ADELBERT V. LEWIS**, of Bisbee  
For Treasurer  
**M. D. SCRIBNER**, of Tombstone  
For Recorder  
**FRANK HARE**, of Tombstone  
For District Attorney  
**E. W. LAND**, of Tombstone  
For Probate Judge  
**C. R. BOSTWICK**, of Huachuca  
For Assessor  
**WALTER T. FIFE**, of St. David  
For Surveyor  
**GEORGE C. CLARK**, of Bisbee  
For Superintendent of Schools  
**E. A. NICHOLS**, of Wilcox  
For Supervisors  
**THOS. R. YORK**, of West Huachuca  
**P. J. DELEHANTY**, of Benson  
**B. F. GRAHAM**, of Bisbee

#### PRECINCT

For Justice of the Peace  
**GEORGE B. WILCOX**  
**J. W. WRIGHT**  
For Constable  
**A. KUNZ**  
**JAMES FAGAN**

**B. A. PACKARD**, Chairman.  
**C. F. NICHOLS**, Secretary.

For Bisbee—James Larson, H. E. Conlon, F. A. Sweet, J. S. Taylor, J. N. Jones, V. R. Siles, M. J. Cunningham and F. S. Douglas.  
For Tombstone—H. J. Gray and J. B. Miano.  
For Wilcox—Dr. R. A. Altco.  
For Pecos—Joseph Signon.  
For Fairbanks and St. David—Charles Noyes.  
For Benson, Tree Alamos and Pool's—S. Friedman.  
For Naco and Herford—E. J. O'Reilly.  
For Fort Huachuca, Huachuca Sliding, West Huachuca, Carr's and Miller's Canyon—D. K. Wardwell.  
For San Simon and Tevison—Jesse Hentley.  
For San Bernardino, Four Bar and Ruckee—John H. Slaughter.  
For Brannock, Wilcox, Dos Cabezas—J. J. Riggs.  
For Turquoise, Middlemarch, Barrett, Hardy, Black Diamond and Copper Bullion—George Land.  
For Russellville, Cochise and Bennett—A. H. Wain.

### Col. Herring Called Down.

Those of our citizens who attended the first republican mass meeting in Bisbee, and who had the patience to sit through Col. Herring's long and tiresome tirade, will remember that he made the extraordinary assertion that the Democratic party was responsible for the failure of the anti-trust legislation by the present congress. Our own congressman, the Hon. J. F. Wilson, disgusted that such barefaced utterances should pass without contradiction, publishes the following:

WILSON ON TRUSTS.  
PRESCOTT, Oct. 22, 1900.  
EDITOR.—On Saturday morning last the Arizona Republican, in an attempted reply to what I and the Hon. John C. Herndon said on trusts, set forth the vote on a resolution introduced by the republican side of congress at last session, June 1st, which it called the test vote on trusts, and in that article very ingeniously assumed that the Republican party was the enemy of trusts and the Democratic party its friend.  
I have been waiting to see what the press would do with that statement, and as it has done nothing to date, and knowing that the article needs answer, I, over my own signature, make this reply:  
The article intended to say and does

say, that the Republican party attempted to destroy the power of the trusts by the resolution which it quotes, and that the Democratic party prevented it.

My reply is that the resolution introduced in congress, and opposed by the democracy, from its very language can't be construed to be anything less than the centralization of the powers of government in congress over the states and not destruction of trusts; and for that reason the democracy opposed it. To be plain, I mean to say that it meant the centralization of power, the destruction of state rights, the destruction of the power of the states to control their own internal and domestic affairs, and it means nothing else. For that reason the democracy opposed it.

The very meat of the resolution is contained in the second section, and listen to it: "Sec. 2. Congress shall have power to define, regulate, control, prohibit or dissolve trusts, monopolies or combinations, whether existing in the form of a combination or otherwise. To all this the Democracy consented. Not a single objection was ever made by the Democratic party in congress to that. But the following was the trouble; listen to the conclusion, it says: "The several states may continue to exercise such power in any manner not in conflict with the laws of the United States." This is the language of the conclusion of that resolution. Can any American read it and misunderstand its meaning? When it says the several states may continue to exercise power, etc., in any manner not in conflict with the laws of the United States it can mean nothing less than destruction of states sovereignty, the destruction of the rights of the states to control their internal domestic affairs and the centralizing of the power of government in congress. A great centralized power, therefore, destroying state rights and state sovereignty, was the forecast of that resolution; and therefore the democracy opposed it, and some of the Republicans did the same thing.

The country knows as well as I that the disposition of the Republican party has long been trending toward the concentration of power in the general government, and in this disguise, blinding the eyes of the people with the name of opposing trusts, it attempted to effect it. Loyal Democrats couldn't do otherwise than oppose it. True Americans, believing in a harmonious republic composed of sovereign states, couldn't do otherwise than oppose it, and hence the Democracy did oppose it.

Before I conclude I want to say another thing which condemns the good faith of the Republican party on the question of destroying trusts?  
After that resolution, centralizing power in congress and destroying state rights, had been passed upon, voted down if you please, then the republican party introduced the bill proposing the regulation of trusts &c. to which the democracy did not object in the main; but it was thought not complete by the party in congress, the language being broad, covering combinations and organizations. The democracy introduced an amendment proposing that the law should not apply to labor unions, trade unions, the organizations of farmers, farmer's alliance &c. so that the masses should not be imposed upon by the bill Did that Bill pass? The answer is most emphatic that it did not. Why? Because the republican party opposed it and side tracked it and prevented it, because of the amendment which was attached to it. If the republican party intended good faith toward the people, the masses, the consumers and the producers of the country why would they defeat a bill called "A bill to destroy trusts" when the amendment prevented it from applying to the masses and their organizations?

Furthermore, as a matter of bad faith, and which showed bad faith, when that resolution offered as a constitutional amendment, brought in by the dominant party in congress, and offered as a constitutional to be voted on by the states it was reported with a rule which prevented amendment. The democratic side of the house tried, and tried in vain, to amend the resolution so as to save the rights of the states and to prevent the destruction of their authority to control their own internal domestic affairs. This was prevented by the republican side. The effort I say was vain. It was an effort to save the state rights and the sovereign power of the states to control their own internal affairs. But I say again it was in vain.  
Therefore, we can't help but conclude that it was introduced, not in

good faith? Therefore, if the republican party was not bent on the destruction of state rights, and, the centralization of the powers of government in congress, why would they oppose such an amendment? The very question furnishes its own answer. That they did it is a matter of record; and that they did it cannot be denied.

Therefore, I conclude with the remark that the constitutional amendment offered in the form of a resolution by the dominant party in congress was intended to make a centralization of the power of government in congress and was never intended to destroy the trusts at all. Read the language and construe it otherwise if you can; and I challenge the Republicans or anybody else, if they can, to show it otherwise by English analysis.

Respectfully,  
J. F. WILSON.

### Senatorial Problem.

I am strongly in favor of the election of United States senators by the people; in other words bringing them nearer to the people, in direct touch with them, for we are well aware that there are many men in the senate now, that would not be there if they were subject to election by the people. Millions are in the senate, corporations, syndicates, combinations, monopolies, aggregations of capital, and trusts, each have their representatives in the senate, and while this is the case there will be no opportunity for poor men who have brains, intellectuality, honor and integrity only before the masses of the people. Our doctrine is that the place should be open to all, rich and poor, alike, without the corrupting influence of money.—James S. Robinson.

### Constitutional Expansion.

I am in favor of constitutional expansion, and opposed to imperialism and imperialistic rule in any of the countries belonging to the United States. I find no authority in the constitution to govern any country of the United States or the inhabitants thereof as colonies or dependencies; such governments in my judgment belong to the monarchies of the old world.—James S. Robinson.

### Notes.

The people of Pinal county are anxious to beat Murphy solely on the grounds of his position on the arid land question. The Florence Tribune says: "He favors the cession of the arid lands to the territory, which would inevitably lead to their gobbling up by the syndicates." The Pinal people believe with Mr. Bryan that a small portion of the money spent by the national government in the Philippines should be used instead to reclaim these arid wastes. Arizona needs practically no appropriations for rivers and harbors, and should receive appropriations for the reclaiming of desert land instead.

Nearly every county has its own particular grievances against Gov. Murphy with the exception of Cochise. Probably his mine blacklist proclamation has kept some capital out of the county, but the principal opposition to him here is on his position in national politics. He is in perfect accord with Hanna and McKinley, and has no sympathy with any single principle that Mr. Bryan is the champion of. Cochise would not give a very large vote to either Hanna or McKinley, if it had the opportunity, and will not give many votes to their representative and supporter.

### Democratic Dates.

The Territorial Central Committee were obliged to change some of the dates for Cochise county. The following is the latest schedule:  
Tombstone—Wednesday, October 31.  
Bisbee—Monday, November 5th.

The enthusiastic reception accorded Mark Smith at every point where he has spoken on his present tour shows that he has lost nothing of his old-time popularity, and he will receive an old-time Democratic majority on November 6.—Silver Belt.

Neely, who robbed the Cuban mails has not yet been sent back to Cuba, but occupies pleasant prison quarters in New York. Is the administration afraid to stir up that postal scandal before election?—Enterprise.

"You republicans want people to bow before the flag. I want people to turn their faces toward it and thank God that there is one flag on which there is no blood."—Bryan.